

identifying information related to
prevent
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

INTERIC COPY

H4

MAY 09 2006

FILE:

Office: VIENNA, AUSTRIA

Date:

IN RE:

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under § 212(a)(9)(B) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to
the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Assistant Officer in Charge, Vienna, Austria. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Poland who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to § 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year and seeking readmission within 10 years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative filed by his U.S. citizen daughter. He is married to a lawful permanent resident (LPR) of the United States and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his wife.

The assistant officer in charge found that based on the evidence in the record, the applicant had failed to establish extreme hardship to his wife. The application was denied accordingly. On appeal, the applicant asserts that he is suffering mental anguish as a result of the separation from his wife. He submits medical evidence in support of his emotional condition. The AAO finds that the applicant has not overcome the assistant officer in charge's reasons for denial.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(B) Aliens Unlawfully Present.-

(i) In general. - Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

....

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

....

(v) Waiver. - The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien.

In the present application, the record indicates that the applicant entered the United States on a visitor visa on April 13, 1993, with permission to remain until October 13, 1993. The applicant remained in the United States until he departed in September 1999. The applicant thus accrued unlawful presence from April 1, 1997, the date of enactment of unlawful presence provisions under the Act, until September 1999. In applying to adjust his status to that of Lawful Permanent Resident (LPR), the applicant is seeking admission within 10 years of his departure from the United States. The applicant is, therefore, inadmissible to the United States under § 212(a)(9)(B)(II) of the Act for being unlawfully present in the United States for a period of more than one year.

A § 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from § 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the alien himself experiences upon deportation is irrelevant to § 212(a)(9)(B)(v) waiver proceedings. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to § 212(i) of the Act. These factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

On appeal, the applicant submits information relating to his own hardship. As noted above, this is not a factor for consideration in the § 212(i) waiver. The applicant has provided no new or additional information regarding hardship his spouse would suffer due to his inadmissibility. In her affidavit submitted with the I-601 form, the applicant's wife wrote that she suffered in the applicant's absence, and did not want to be forced to choose between her daughter, in the United States, and the applicant, in Poland. She also wrote that observing her daughter's and grandchildren's unfulfilled desire to be with the applicant caused her emotional pain. The AAO notes that in almost every case of families divided due to inadmissibility or removal, individuals are faced with difficult choices and emotional hardship. In order to obtain the § 212(i) waiver, the applicant must show that his qualifying relative's suffering is greater than that which is, unfortunately, normal in similar situations.

U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be

expected upon deportation. [REDACTED] v. *INS*, *supra*, held further that the uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported. Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court has held that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship. *INS* v. [REDACTED] 450 U.S. 139 (1981). The AAO recognizes that the applicant's wife will endure hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, her situation is typical to individuals separated as a result of deportation or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's spouse caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under § 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* § 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.